



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

REVIEWS.

Die Ilias und Homer. Von ULRICH von WILAMOWITZ-MOELLENDORFF. Berlin, Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1916. 523 pp. 8°.

This book—the story of its genesis is told in the opening pages—presents the conclusions reached after thirty years' study of the problem by a man who has long been ranked among the foremost Hellenists of the world. As was to be expected, it is a work that cannot be disregarded by anyone who is sincerely interested in the origins of the Homeric poems. Its conclusions, however, are presented, not in relation to opinions previously held upon the question, but merely as *aperçus* of the author. That is the chief defect of the book recognized by the author himself and ascribed to the wartimes which provided the only possible excuse, "for going my way straight to the goal, without looking much to right or left"—that is, for ignoring other writings on the subject. The result is to increase the dogmatic tone which is not entirely absent from Wilamowitz' other writings; but one who can guard his freedom of thought against this will find in the book much that is stimulating and helpful along with many conclusions from which I think it necessary to dissent.

To the reviewer whose space is necessarily limited the book presents an exceptionally difficult problem. Previous investigators have usually begun with an effort to define the nucleus of the poem. Wilamowitz proposes to start from the other end, and remove the later accretions layer by layer. The comparison with the systematic excavation of an archeologic site is present (p. 24) in his mind, and I may continue the comparison to express my general impression of his book. It is as if the work had progressed unequally in different parts of the field; the excavation being carried down at points to bedrock, while elsewhere the excavator has stopped among the upper strata, hesitating to disturb the beauty of what he has found. The result is on the one hand a clearer understanding and better appreciation of the topmost strata, but on the other hand confusion about the earlier strata and misinterpretation of the history of the site as a whole. To report fully upon the excavation would mean to write another book of at least equal bulk, and I must go to the other extreme and merely indicate briefly a few matters that seem to me of the greatest moment.

I may single out in the first place the attention regularly given to the problems of the "lower" criticism as a characteristic which makes Wilamowitz' book contrast favorably with other recent works on the same subject. In connection with this is to

be noted the excellent account (pp. 4-8) of the origin of our text. On the main point "*unser Text ist eine Revision, die im zweiten Jahrhundert v. Chr. unter Zuziehung von Handschriften gemacht ist*" I can agree with the author, though I believe that it is now possible to be more detailed and precise. I must admire also the neatness with which he draws the practical conclusion: "*Es ist daher verzweifelt naiv, wenn man sich wundert, wie eine bare Interpolation sich 'in allen Handschriften' befinden könnte.*" It is true that this text of Aristarchus is a revision of that of Aristophanes, but that is not a sufficient reason for simply obliterating the difference by *Aristarchus das heisst Aristophanes* (p. 121) and similar formulae. It is a service, however, when the author very properly emphasizes (p. 6) the folly and injustice of allowing our judgment of Zenodotus to be biassed by the one-sided nature of the reports of his edition which have reached us. Before Zenodotus there was no vulgate, only a chaos (p. 7), "*eine Masse ganz gewaltig abweichender Handschriften.*" To that I would agree in a certain sense, though I would not go so far as to believe with Wilamowitz (p. 12) that there were in the library of Alexandria manuscripts of the *Odyssey* that ended with ψ 296 and contained therefore as a matter of course another version of the poem—one in which Laertes was dead, and the parts referring to him were missing. The proof of "*die Jugend unserer Odyssee*" drawn (p. 5 n.) from the agreement of P. Rylands 53 with our manuscripts is anything but cogent. If any conclusion is to be drawn it is that our manuscripts, or families of manuscripts, descend from an archetype or archetypes but little older than this papyrus. We have good reason to be grateful to the Alexandrians, but we must always remember (p. 8) that our text is only a selection made by them from a mass of variants, between which—as far as they are reported—we have a perfect right to choose.

Behind this there is to my mind another unity—the Attic edition of Homer. To such an idea Wilamowitz is opposed. The question of the *μεταχαρακτηρισμός* is not discussed; it is swept aside in a single sentence (p. 8), "*So giebt es denn auch bei den Grammatikern keine orthographischen Varianten, die irgendwie für Alter, Herkunft oder Integrität des Textes von Belang wären.*"¹ An appendix (pp. 506-511) discusses Wackernagel's work without touching the questions really at issue. The unity to which Wilamowitz comes is a poem A-H A-O-

¹I should agree rather with Thumb, *Handb. d. gr. Dial.*, pp. 320f., and Wackernagel, *Sprachl. Unters. zu Homer*, pp. 83ff. I may call attention to the variants at B 573 which can best be explained as arising from the confusion of ΔΟΝΟΕΞΑΝ and ΔΟΝΟΕΞΑΝ in an Attic manuscript. It is a type of error which could not be expected to occur frequently.

Patrocleia-Achilleis which he calls the Iliad of Homer and dates about 750 B. C., or rather it is this poem in a number of recensions. Of these he distinguishes one with a reworking of the *Patrocleia-Achilleis* by the author of ΣΤ made at a time when this section had not yet been embodied in the Iliad; a later reworking which has affected ΥΦ especially; a third with the substitution of Ω and eventually Ψ²Ω for the death of Achilles which originally closed the poem; and finally a fourth with the insertion of ΘΙΚ. Preferences of the rhapsodists are held to have determined which of these recensions should survive.

They have survived however in an interpolated form, and methodically the first step should have been the removal of these interpolations. Had that been attempted the result would have been a chapter corresponding to the first part of Blass' *Interpolationen in der Odyssee*. I must regret that this was not done—although it is easy to see how repugnant it would have been to Wilamowitz as an artist. Instead, the matter has been scattered throughout the work, frequently in footnotes; and apparently it has at times been neglected as too trivial.

Wilamowitz declines (p. 11) to be guided by linguistic criteria—and that is to my mind a decision that necessarily vitiates his work. For him the chief thing (p. 25) is his appreciation of differences of style, as a matter of *ἄλογος αἴσθησις*. That seems to me an uncertain guide, and to be accepted only in the absence of other indications. It helps most in the top-most strata where the possibilities are fewest.

Thus his views on the section of the Iliad lying between H 322 and A 1 are in my opinion substantially² correct; Bethe (p. 107 n. 1) reached independently practically the same result. In addition to more important questions these two scholars differ upon a matter of detail which seems to admit of a definite settlement. Wilamowitz proposes (pp. 52ff.) to regard the *Building of the Wall* (H 323-344, 433-465) as an interpolation; Bethe (p. 218 n. 4) argues against this suggestion. Neither uses the decisive argument: Thucydides (cf. Murray, RGE² pp. 312f., and the literature there cited) learned his Iliad from a manuscript in which these lines were not written. That shows we are dealing with an interpolation, though not necessarily with one that is post-Thucydidean in date. In claiming that it is non-Athenian Wilamowitz is at fault;³ he seems at fault also

² Note that Θ 489ff. is older than the beginning of Θ, and is afterwards (p. 184) so explained by Wilamowitz.

³ It is an interesting possibility that the interpolation is not all of one piece. According to Didymus *οἱ περὶ Ζηνόδοτον καὶ Ἀριστοφάνη καὶ αὐτὸς Ἀριστάρχος* (cf. sch. T at 443 and sch. A at 452) athetized *τὴν ἀγορὰν τῶν θεῶν*. According to Aristonicus the athetesis was defined as extending from 443-464, cf. sch. A at 443. That was a slip (it

in believing (p. 64 n. 3) that the recognition of this interpolation entails the rejection of I 346-356.

The most interesting part of the work and the one of most permanent value is that which deals with the ending of the poem. As far back as Heyne a difference of tone in the last six books of the Iliad was observed. The idea dropped partly under the charm of the poetry of X, partly because the *Slaying of Hector* was obviously a necessary part of the story. Later Robert suggested that the original end of the Iliad had been cut away and its place filled by a "Εκτορος ἀνάλξεις. Wilamowitz too finds in the end of the Iliad a separate poem which he christens the *Achilleis*. There is similarity and difference in these ideas, and it will be worth while to follow them in some detail. Both scholars believe that their poems have been re-worked; Robert distinguishing three stages in the development of the "Εκτορος ἀνάλξεις, and Wilamowitz differentiating the *Achilleis* of "Homer," the epos of the author of ΣΤ and a redaction most marked in ΥΦ. To begin with Υ Robert claims for his original poem lines 353-503, Wilamowitz likewise rejects the first 352 lines. Of the remainder he is hypercritical, but can make no further analysis beyond the unlikely suggestion (cf. Leaf) that the closing simile is the interpolation of a rhapsodist. I can see no need for going beyond the belief that the author of the *Achilleis* finds this part of his subject less congenial and has helped himself with borrowed material. From Φ both take two large sections: Robert 1-138, 228-304; Wilamowitz 1-136, 235-304; the juncture made by Wilamowitz being by far the superior.⁴ Wilamowitz picks up the old poem again in 520; Robert prefixes 515-517 to this line, an error due to his failure to follow Zenodotus in athetizing 538-539. Both continue without important break to X 166 from which Robert passes immediately to 208 while Wilamowitz makes the splendid suggestion that 166 199-201 208 is the proper sequence. From X 208-394 the two scholars are again in agreement.⁵

For the section from Υ 353 to X 394 substantially the same conclusions have thus been reached by two scholars, although they have approached the problem from different ends and with

should be 442-464) which was pounced upon by hostile critics, cf. sch. T at 464: ἀποπον γὰρ ἦν εἰπεῖν 'ὥς οἱ μὲν πονέοντο' (442) εἶτα εὐθὺς 'δύσετό τ' ἥλιος (465). The athetesis thus corrected is reasonable; if it was based in part on manuscript evidence, these lines would be still younger than their surroundings.

⁴ Robert also omits 17-33 in consequence of what we shall see is a wrong determination of the scope of the poem; the other differences are of minimal importance.

⁵ Wilamowitz' athetesis of X 1-4 seems unnecessary; other questions in this book are of minimal importance and show more agreement than disagreement between the two analysts.

different criteria. In the midst of the clamor raised by the Unitarians about the unending divergence of the analyses the fact is worth noting; and it entitles us, I believe, to handle this reconstructed poem as a reality. As it stands it is a torso, and the question comes of how it is to be completed. Wilamowitz has shown that we have not (as Robert believed) reached the end of the poem, but that it ran on much as in our text to Ψ 257 and ended with the death of Achilles. The original ending has been sacrificed in order that Ω might take its place—the *Games* being a still later addition. That necessitated a reworking of Ψ , the elimination⁶ of the *ἀευκεία ἔργα* wrought upon the body of Hector.

The problem of the beginning of the *Achilleis* is abandoned (p. 181) by Wilamowitz; the most he will say is that it reached back, as X shows, at least to the Polydamas scene and must therefore have included a *Reconciliation*. More than this seems possible. When we picked up at Y 353 the thread of the *Achilleis* we were in the midst of a battle. Before that must have come the opening of the battle, the marching forth of the host—a scene somewhat like the opening of Λ only with Achilles instead of Agamemnon as the central figure. Exactly what we require is to be found at the end of T, and I see no reason for refusing to follow Robert and accept it as part of this poem. Nor can I agree to the demand of Wilamowitz that the *Achilleis* must include a formal reconciliation with Agamemnon; we may therefore pass back immediately to the events of the preceding night. It is filled in our text by two parallel scenes (Σ 243-355) which describe the Trojan *agora* and the mourning over Patroclus. The allusion in X 100 to the first of these shows that we have here at least the substance of the *Achilleis*, whether it has been reworked⁷ as Wilamowitz (pp. 171f.) thinks cannot be discussed here. One more item must have stood in the poem—the revelation to Achilles of the connection between Hector's death and his own. Earlier in Σ we have such a scene, but this is the point at which the *Achilleis* is joined to the *Iliad*, and the attempt at further analysis must be allowed to rest.⁸

In other parts of the poem Wilamowitz' analysis has been much less successful. An instance may be seen in his treatment of the *Patrocleia*. The study of his book has not lead me to

⁶ That this had taken place was previously suggested by J. A. K. Thomson, ap. RGE² 147f.

⁷ The strangest thing is the absence of all reference to the slaying of Patroclus in the speeches of Polydamas and Hector, but that is true also of Hector's speech in X. Did the *Achilleis* here betray the fact that Patroclus fought in his own armor?

⁸ Note however the absence in Σ 35-127 of all expressions of a wish to save the body of Patroclus. In the original concept the scene took place after the rescue was effected.

modify my belief in the substantial correctness of Robert's analysis—except for the latter's attempt to show that the change of armor is an old motif. In that Wilamowitz is correct, and Bethe has made (pp. 80-86) an even better presentation of the argument. The curious thing is how slightly Robert's analysis is affected⁹ by this correction. Wilamowitz is also right (agreeing with Robert against Bethe) in ascribing Automedon and the chariot of Achilles to the earliest stratum; but the linguistic evidence against the Sarpedon episode is decisive. The attempt to find in the *Patrocleia* an independent lay I must regard as a failure.

Space forbids the giving of further illustrations, and I must content myself with recording my dissent from the proposition in which (p. 514) the theory of Wilamowitz culminates that Λ , the scenes relating to the gods in $N\Xi O$ together with ΦX and the first part of Ψ are the "*eigene Erfindung oder doch Gestaltung*" of a single individual.

Another feature of the work must at least be mentioned—the literary appreciations of certain portions of the *Iliad*. One can read them with enjoyment and with profit, even though he may not be in agreement with the author's analysis. As examples I may refer to the treatment (pp. 92-115) of $X\Psi^1$ or to the paragraphs (pp. 161-162) that contrast the *Patrocleia* with the *Achilleis*; the treatment too of Λ , A and B may be noted especially. I would call attention also to the section (pp. 322-330) on the lay, the short epos, the epos, and the development of structural art in them and to the following chapter headed *Sage, Lied und Epos*.

The proof-reading was not too careful. There are, moreover, some *quisquiliae* which cannot be laid at the door of the printer. On pp. 45ff. the scene of the death of Antilochus is twice ascribed to the *Ilias Parva* instead of the *Aethiopis*, so also Robert, p. 165. "*Die alte Schale von Kamiros, auf der Euphorbos und Menelaos um Patroklos kämpfen*" (p. 144 n.) must be the one on which Hector and Menelaos fight over Euphorbus. On p. 185 the notes are wrongly divided—after what has happened to Croiset it may be expected that some Unitarian will find therein cause for cheap triumph. On p. 186 n. 2 is found: "*φηγός sollen wir uns gewöhnen mit Eiche zu übersetzen, nicht mit Buche, als ob es lateinisch wäre.*" The remark seems strangely out of date, until one notices that the rendering "*Buche*" is twice found (pp. 98, 99) in Wilamowitz' own work. The etymology of $\Sigma\omega\kappa\omicron\varsigma$ (p. 191) should not have been printed after the publication of Bechtel's *Lexilogus*. Sarpedon is not, as stated on

⁹ Read in Π 64 (U. I. 1601) *ἀρία τεύχεα* and drop Π 140-144 (U. I. 1657-1661) and perhaps Π 796-797 (U. I. 1820-1821).

p. 214, wounded in M. The sentence (p. 258) "*Auch der Mangel der Gleichnisse weist in die spätere Zeit; sonst müsste die Odyssee primitiver als die Ilias sein, und der Demeter Hymnus primitiver als die Odyssee*" shows a lapse into Unitarian logic.

GEORGE MELVILLE BOLLING.

THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY.

The Stonyhurst Pageants edited with introduction by CARLETON BROWN (*Hesperia*, Ergänzungsreihe: Schriften zur englischen Philologie herausgegeben von James W. Bright, 7. Heft). Göttingen and Baltimore. 1920.

A hitherto unpublished fragmentary cycle of Old Testament plays, preserved in Ms. A. VI. 33, Library of Stonyhurst College, has been issued in *Hesperia* under the editorship of Professor CARLETON BROWN. The work has been in progress since June 1914, and was prevented from being issued by the outbreak of the war. The manuscript is mentioned in *Hist. Mss. Com. Report III*, Appendix p. 338 a. Fifty-five leaves have been lost from the beginning and five leaves between folios 120 and 126. Material is also lost from the end of the manuscript, the last folio preserved being 190. There is also some disarrangement of folios. What we have left is twelve pageants, as follows: of *Jacob* (fragmentary), 106 ll.; of *Joseph*, 1048 ll.; of *Moses*, 1584 ll.; of *Josue*, 552 ll.; of *Gedeon*, 310 ll.; of *Jephthe*, 292 ll.; of *Samson*, 392 ll.; of *Saul* (a few lines at beginning lost), 1445 ll.; of *David*, 690 ll.; of *Salomon*, 370 ll.; of *Elias*, 815 ll.; of *Naaman*, 1136 ll. The pageants are numbered and the editor conjectures that there have been lost from the beginning of the cycle pageants dealing with the familiar subjects of the Creation, the Fall, Cain and Abel, Noah, and Abraham. He also conjectures that the thirteenth pageant which fell in the gap between folios 120 and 126 dealt with the story of Ruth. The pageant of *Naaman* which ends the cycle is also incomplete, and the editor estimates that without regard to further plays in the cycle the eighteen provided for must have reached the enormous total of 13,000 lines.

On the basis of proper names scribbled on the manuscript and of dialect, the editor concludes that the manuscript belongs to Lancashire, the region where it was found. He has also made the happy discovery that the plays are based upon the Douay version of the Bible, a conclusion which must be regarded as